

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8                   UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9                   WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
10                  AT TACOMA

11                  JOHN DAVID EVERETT,

12                  Plaintiff,

13                  v.

14                  PIERCE COUNTY PROSECUTING  
15                  ATTORNEY'S OFFICE *et al.*,

16                  Defendants.

17  
18                  Case No. C07-5137RBL

19  
20                  ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

21  
22                  This Civil Rights action has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to Title 28  
23 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). Plaintiff was given leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Plaintiff is challenging the  
24 length of a criminal sentence he has received in the Pierce County Superior Court.

25                  The court now **ORDERS PLAINTIFF TO SHOW CAUSE** why this action should not be  
26 dismissed prior to service. When a person is challenging the very fact or duration of his physical  
27 imprisonment, and the relief he seeks will determine that he is or was entitled to immediate release or a  
28 speedier release from that imprisonment, his sole federal remedy is a writ of habeas corpus. Preiser v.  
Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 500 (1973). In June 1994, the United States Supreme Court held that "[e]ven a  
prisoner who has fully exhausted available state remedies **has no cause of action under § 1983 unless**  
**and until the conviction or sentence is reversed, expunged, invalidated, or impugned by the grant of**

1 **a writ of habeas corpus."** Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477, 487 (1994)(emphasis added). The court  
2 added:

3 Under our analysis the statute of limitations poses no difficulty while the state challenges are  
4 being pursued, since the § 1983 claim has not yet arisen. . . . [A] § 1983 cause of action for  
damages attributable to an unconstitutional conviction or sentence does not accrue until the  
conviction or sentence has been invalidated.

5 Id. at 489. “[T]he determination whether a challenge is properly brought under § 1983 must be made  
6 based upon whether ‘the nature of the challenge to the procedures [is] such as necessarily to imply the  
7 invalidity of the judgment.’ *Id.* If the court concludes that the challenge would necessarily imply the  
8 invalidity of the judgment or continuing confinement, then the challenge must be brought as a petition for a  
9 writ of habeas corpus, not under § 1983.” Butterfield v. Bail, 120 F.3d 1023, 1024 (9th Cir.1997)  
10 (*quoting Edwards v. Balisok*, 520 U.S. 641 (1997)).

11 Plaintiff has not indicated he has received relief in habeas corpus. At the current time it appears he  
12 fails to state a claim. Plaintiff should show cause why this action should not be dismissed for failure to  
13 state a claim on or before **June 29, 2007**. The Clerk is directed to send plaintiff a copy of this to plaintiff  
14 and note the **June 29, 2007**, due date on the court’s calendar.  
15

16  
17 DATED this 25 day of May, 2007.  
18  
19

20 /S/ *J. Kelley Arnold*  
J. Kelley Arnold  
21 United States Magistrate Judge  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28